



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/606,573	06/26/2003	Todd Karakashian	ORACL-01282US1	4687
80548	7590	08/28/2008	EXAMINER	
Fliesler Meyer LLP			SHAW, PELING ANDY	
650 California Street				
14th Floor			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
San Francisco, CA 94108			2144	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			08/28/2008	PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	10/606,573	KARAKASHIAN ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	PELING A. SHAW	2144	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 24 July 2008.
- 2a) This action is **FINAL**.                    2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-24 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-24 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)           |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .                                    |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>6/27/08, 7/24/08</u> . | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
|   | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ .                        |

**DETAILED ACTION**

***Continued Examination under 37 CFR 1.114***

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 06/27/2008 has been entered. Claims 1, 11 and 20-23 are amended. Claim 24 is new. Claims 1-24 are currently pending.
2. Amendment received on 08/31/2007 was entered into record. Claims 1-12, 14-16 and 20 were amended. Claims 21-23 were new.

***Priority***

3. This application is a CIP of 10/366,236 filed on 02/13/2003 which claims benefit of 60/359,098 filed on 02/22/2002 and claims benefit of 60/392,217 filed on 06/27/2002. The filing date is 06/26/2003.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless --

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 1-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Amirisetty et al. (US 7152090 B2), hereinafter referred as Amirisetty.

- a. Regarding claim 1, Amirisetty disclosed a storage medium including software system applications for providing access to web services (column 1, lines 52-56: J2EE CA), comprising: a container driver that accepts invoke request for a web service from a client (column 1, lines 60-62: CCI; column 5, lines 54-61: invoke through J2EE CA connector), an interceptor that receives initial message context for the invoke request for the web service from said container driver, the initial message context including a plurality of parts each of which includes corresponding content, and modifies the content of one or more of the parts of the initial message context to produce modified message context for the web service, the modified message context including the same plurality of parts as the initial message context but with the content of one or more parts differing from the initial message context (column 4, lines 26-58: map high-level XML dialect to action flow of connector-level invocations and result

tertiary results to yield an output object to be returned, input and results data objects; column 6, lines 8-18: modify metadata content; column 6, lines 52-62: unified representation of interaction specification, in memory representations of records; column 11, lines 42: XML DTD for high-level function definitions, input and output type definition, sequence of input/out transformation, initializers for secondary data objects; column 12, lines 1-20: consume XML schema/DTD definitions and generate components/classes for runtime use by XML content type handlers; column 12, lines 56-67: handlers require runtime component derived from input/output type definitions; column 13, lines 13-25: return result as payload in the response message of the service request; column 14, lines 10-30: ejbmethoD; in light of applicant's paragraph 27 of specification; Fig. 7, column 15, lines 19-41: MIME/mullti-part-message ServiceExecute, create XML record out of payload, execute using interaction application and XML record, take the output XML record and populate outgoing MIME/multi-part-message; column 15, line 55 through column 16, line 45: flowchart illustrating using a metadata-aware Enterprise Application Integration built on top of adaptor/connector for external system interface and data object transformed from business XML to XML protocol); and an invocation handler that receives the modified message context from said container driver, passes parameters from the modified message context to the target of the request, processes values returned from the target, and passes the values to the container driver, such that the container driver can formulate a response to the invoke request (Fig. 4; column 6, line 63-column 7, line 17: high-level function invoke low-level calls in sequence through connector;

- column 8, lines 10-21: sequence of low-level function calls perform high-level function and return results).
- b. Regarding claim 2, Amirisetty disclosed the storage medium of claim 1 wherein the client utilizes JAX-RPC to invoke the web services (Fig. 3; column 13, lines 13-25: server wrapper receives JAX-RPC).
  - c. Regarding claim 3, Amirisetty disclosed the storage medium of claim 1 wherein said container driver is adapted to perform any data binding and unbinding required to process the invoke request (column 12, lines 12-20 and 44-55: JAXB).
  - d. Regarding claim 4, Amirisetty disclosed the storage medium of claim 1, further comprising a protocol adapter that intercepts web service invoke requests and passes the web service invoke requests to said container driver (column 9, lines 14-20: CCI adaptor provide a unified representation; lines 44-46: see Business XML; column 10, lines 30-35: convert Business XML to protocol XML).
  - e. Regarding claim 5, Amirisetty disclosed the storage medium of claim 4, wherein said protocol adapter converts the format of an invoke request and create a message context containing the invoke request (column 9, lines 14-20: CCI adaptor provide a unified representation; lines 44-46: see Business XML; column 10, lines 30-35: convert Business XML to protocol XML).
  - f. Regarding claim 6, Amirisetty disclosed the storage medium of claim 1, further comprising a plugin component to be used by said container driver to perform any data binding and unbinding (column 10, lines 30-42: pluggable JAXB).

- g. Regarding claim 7, Amirisetty disclosed the storage medium of claim 1, further comprising an invocation context for storing arbitrary context data useful in processing the web request, said invocation context available to at least one of said interceptor and said invocation handler (column 11, lines 27-35: metadata stored in metadata repository).
- h. Regarding claim 8, Amirisetty disclosed the storage medium of claim 1, wherein said invocation handler manages security policies, transaction management, and target object life cycle for the request (column 1, lines 52-60: managing resource pooling, transactions and security).
- i. Regarding claim 9, Amirisetty disclosed the storage medium of claim 1, further comprising a web service container for hosting said container driver, said interceptor, and said invocation handler (column 1, lines 52-60: J2EE CA in Web/Application server).
- j. Regarding claim 10, Amirisetty disclosed the storage medium of claim 1, further comprising a target object to which said invocation handler can delegate processing the invoke request (column 13, lines 13-25: request payload as input to target function).
- k. Claim 11 and 20 are of the same scope as claim 1. These are rejected for the same reasons as for claim 1.
- l. Claims 12-19 are of the same scope as claims 1-5 and 7-10. These are rejected for the same reasons as for claims 1-5 and 7-10.

m. Regarding claim 21, Amirisetty disclosed the storage medium of claim 1, wherein the plurality of parts for the initial message context and the plurality of parts for the modified message context each include a request message and a response message with a difference between the initial message context and the modified message context being the content of one or more of these parts (column 4, lines 26-58: map high-level XML dialect to action flow of connector-level invocations and result tertiary results to yield an output object to be returned, input and results data objects; column 6, lines 52-62: unified representation of interaction specification, in memory representations of records; column 11, lines 42: XML DTD for high-level function definitions, input and output type definition, sequence of input/out transformation, initializers for secondary data objects; column 12, lines 56-67: handlers require runtime component derived from input/output type definitions; column 13, lines 13-25: return result as payload in the response message of the service request; column 14, lines 10-30: ejbmethod; Fig. 6, column 14, line 62-column 15, line 4: Business XML, transformation and return).

n. Regarding claim 22, Amirisetty disclosed the storage medium of claim 7, wherein the content of the invocation context component includes at one of the following: a conversation ID; a message sequence number; and a security token (column 3, lines 29-56: a framework consisting of a sequence of low-level calls to guarantee sequence/order; column 8, lines 47-62: metadata repository includes the definitions of connection specifications; column 9, lines 11-19: declarative transactional and security features; column 11, lines 42-67: security constraints attributes of data

- source; column 15, lines 20-41: read the property set to determine the connector to talk to, the connection specification and the caller identity).
- o. Claim 23 is of the same scope as claim 1. It is rejected for the same reasons as for claim 1.
  - p. Regarding claim 24, Amirisetty disclosed the storage medium of claim 1, wherein the initial message context and the modified message context each include transport information, wherein the transport information comprises information specific to the transport over which the request came, and over which the response is sent (column 8, lines 47-62: metadata repository includes the definitions of connection specifications; column 9, lines 20-29: accessible using various protocols, such as HTTP, HTTPS, etc.; column 10, lines 43-67: service provider interface defined as a set of interfaces representing connector interaction with the application server; column 14, lines 10-30: ejbmethode, get connection; column 15, lines 20-41: read the property set to determine the connector to talk to, the connection specification and the caller identity).

Amirisetty disclosed all limitations of claims 1-24. Claims 1-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e).

***Response to Arguments***

5. Applicant's arguments filed on 06/27/2008 have been fully considered, but they are not persuasive.
  - a. Applicant has amended the claim with minor changes from the term of "component" to "part" and has separated the limitation on "transport information" from claim 21 to claim 24. Applicant has further cited sections from applicant's specification in support the previous and current amendment. Examiner has reviewed the amendment in light of the cited references and would accept the amendment as it is now.
  - b. Examiner has further performed a search based upon the amended limitations with respect the claim as whole. It seems that Amirisetty has all the limitations, including the limitation on transporting information. Claim rejections are updated to reflect the current amendment and identified references from Amirisetty.
  - c. Applicant argues (2<sup>nd</sup> paragraph on page 10 of current amendment) that Amirisetty will clearly not have same plurality of parts as the initial message context. As applicant has cited sections from applicant's original specification in support the amended limitation of "plurality of parts". Examiner has reviewed these cited sections. Examiner has further searched and found Amirisetty that does teach and/or suggest the claimed invention including applicant's amended limitation of "plurality of parts" in light of applicant's specification. The claim rejections above are updated with further extensive references from Amirisetty.
  - d. It is examiner's position that Amirisetty discloses all claimed limitations in the same scope as applicant's specification and applicant has not submitted claims drawn to

limitations, which define the operation and apparatus of Applicant's disclosed invention in manner, which distinguishes over the prior art. As it is Applicant's right to claim as broadly as possible their invention, it is also the Examiner's right to interpret the claim language as broadly as possible. It is the Examiner's position that the detailed functionality that allows for Applicant's invention to overcome the prior art used in the rejection, fails to differentiate in detail how these features are unique (see item a in section 4). Amirisetty has shown that a metadata-aware Enterprise Application Integration (EAI) framework for an application server environment allows the connector writer to connect to a system using a low-level API; provides a space in a connector where the user can define high-level functions; using the framework, the user can mine the metadata for the functions and generate a description of the high-level function which can then be dropped into the framework and appear as a high-level function, invokable through the connector, to the developer; invoking and driveing the low-level API provided by the connector. It is clear that Applicant must be able to submit claim language to distinguish over the prior arts used in the above rejection sections that discloses distinctive features of Applicant's claimed invention. It is suggested that Applicant compare the original specification and claim language with the cited prior art used in the rejection section above or the Remark section below to draw an amended claim set to further the prosecution.

e. Failure for Applicant to narrow the definition/scope of the claims and supply arguments commensurate in scope with the claims implies the Applicant's intent to

broaden claimed invention. Examiner interprets the claim language in a scope parallel to the Applicant in the response. Examiner reiterates the need for the Applicant to more clearly and distinctly define the claimed invention.

***Remarks***

6. The following pertaining arts are discovered and not used in this office action. Office reserves the right to use these arts in later actions.
- a. Banerjee et al. (US 20030131049 A1) Internationalization of the web services infrastructure
  - b. Baller et al. (US 20030118353 A1) Method and apparatus for managing intelligent assets in a distributed environment
  - c. Brown et al. (US 20030110242 A1) Method and apparatus for dynamic reconfiguration of web services infrastructure
  - d. Brittenham et al. (US 20020178254 A1) Dynamic deployment of services in a computing network
  - e. Humpleman et al. (US 6466971 B1) Method and system for device to device command and control in a network: web service
  - f. Faccin et al. (US 20020120729 A1) Internet protocol based service architecture
  - g. Merrick et al. (US 7028312 B1) XML remote procedure call (XML-RPC)
  - h. Kruy et al. (US 7406523 B1) Client-server communications system and method using a semi-connectionless protocol

***Conclusion***

7. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Refer to the enclosed PTO-892 for details.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Peling A. Shaw whose telephone number is (571) 272-7968. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:00 - 4:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, William C. Vaughn can be reached on (571) 272-3922. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571) 273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

/Peling A Shaw/  
Examiner, Art Unit 2144